

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office action of 18 Apr 2005.

Claims 1, 10-13, 17, and 19 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants have canceled claim 8.

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-2 and 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 5-7 and amended

claim 1 so as to render this claim statutory under section 101, including incorporating the limitations of claims 3 and 4 and specifying that the method of the claims is a computer implemented method.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-7, 17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maners, U.S. Patent 6,507,826.

Applicants have canceled 2-7.

Claims 1, 17, and 19 have been amended to specify that commodities are marked at requisition as either receivable or non-receivable. Thereafter, a positive confirmation process is executed for receivable commodities, and a negative confirmation process is executed for non-receivable commodities.

In citing Maners with respect to claims 5-7 (the limitations of which are now recited in each of the claims remaining in the case), the Examiner states:

"Maners discloses receivable (requiring positive confirmation) requisitioned commodities at Col. 8, line 63 to Col. 9, line 52 and Col. 6, lines 5-20, and non-receivable (requiring no confirmation) requisitioned commodities at Col. 5, lines 40-58." [Office Action, page 7.]

Applicants traverse this characterization of Maners. While Maners may discuss positive and negative processing, the decision is not based upon identifying or marking commodities at time of requisition as receivable or non-receivable commodities, and thereafter using that marking to determine whether to process an invoice using a positive confirmation process for commodities marked as receivable, and a negative confirmation process for commodities marked as non-receivable.

Claims 8-16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maners in view of Barnes et al. U.S. Patent 5,970,475.

Applicants have canceled claims 8-16 and 18 without prejudice.

Applicants note that with respect to claim 12, the Examiner had taken Official Notice that it is well known in the art to provide important information to a user upon first access to a data system. However, applicants traverse the suggestion that such a facility from the art makes obvious providing the specific information set forth in applicants claims as part of an invoice approval process.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1, 10-13, 17, and 19.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being

necessary.

Sincerely,

C. S. Baumann, et al.

By


Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 18 Aug 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Patent Attorney
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545